DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 176 SP 032 534

AUTHOR Bauer, Norman J.
TITLE Pedagogy and the "Other" Dimension of Teacher Preparation: A Trend and a Response.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Spring Conference of the Confederated Organizations of Teacher Education (Syracuse, NY, April 26-27, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Educational Improvement; *Educational Trends; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

To reverse a trend in teacher education away from the foundations of education and toward a mechanistic technology, a new approach is suggested. In addition to pedagogy, the professional dimension of undergraduate preparation should emphasize "educology," i.e., knowledge and understanding of the sociological, economic, legal, and political realities that prevail in the larger society. Each of the disciplines, pedagogy and educology, would consist of subdisciplines. Pedagogy would consist of methodologies in each of the subjects taught in the schools, audio-visual practices, classroom management strategies, measurement and evaluation, computer applications, etc. Educology would consist of such subdisciplines as history of education, philosophy of education, curriculum theory, theories of learning, economics, politics, anthropology, sociology of education, and policy studies. These areas of intellectual development, traditionally associated with the foundations of education, have been an essential dimension of the preparation of prospective teachers and must continue to be so. (JD)

Pedagogy and the 'OTHER' Dimension of Teacher Preparation: A Trend and a Response

Presented

by

Norman J. Bauer
State University of New York
Geneseo, New York

Spring Conference
Confederated Organizations of Teacher Education

Syracuse Hotel
Syracuse, New York

April 26-27, 1990

Pedagogy and the 'OTHER' Dimension of Teacher Preparation: A Trend and a Response

Norman J. Bauer
April 27, 1990

Purpose:

The purpose of this paper is (1) to identify a trend which it seems to me has begun to emerge in relation to the preparation of teachers about which I have deep concern. The trend to which I refer is the trend away from curricular experiences which expose prospective teachers to what I refer to in the title of this paper as the 'OTHER' dimension of teacher, the foundations of education. It is a trend which, if continued, poses grave consequences for teachers and the teaching profession, as well as for the normative development of public schooling; and (2) to suggest that, because of the vagueness which often accompanies the expression 'foundations of education', this designation needs to be dropped and another one, one which I shall identify later, be substituted in its place.

Assumption:

The basic assumption upon which this paper is grounded is the belief that there are different forms and uses of knowledge. There is what Ryle has pointed out 'knowledge that... " and 'knowledge how ..."[1] the distinction between these two being the distinction between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. Knowledge how... clearly is related to the sort of knowledge which we think about when pedagogical activity is considered. It is that kind of knowledge which directs one during the planning, implementation and evaluating of classroom teaching. There is also, however, another sort of knowledge, a sort of knowledge which Broudy has described as 'knowledge with ...'. "To know with," Broudy argues, "is to comprehend with a point of view, a value scheme, a style of life. What we know *with* gives meaning to *what* we know."[2] This sort of knowledge is that which constitutes the background of someone who is engaged in 'knowledge how...' It is knowledge of an associative and an interpretive sort, in contrast to knowledge which is replicative or

applicative in its use. I assume that this 'knowledge with...' is absolutely essential to someone who is going to become a significant professional in the classroom, as well as in dialogue with ones colleagues, even though it is not knowledge which is usually going to be the direct focus of teaching.

The Trend:

During the past ten years, but particularly since the publication of A Nation at Risk, there has been an increasing amount of stress placed on the need to improve the instructional competencies of teachers because of the absolute necessity to improve the quality of learning by their students. This stress has gone under the rubric of 'pedagogy' and has gradually come to assume primary, if not total, importance in the minds of those engaged in the preparation of teachers. Practically every one of the major reports which we have witnessed during the past seven years has stressed the need to improve the classroom competencies of teachers and the learning outcomes of their students. Each of these reports has given heavy emphasis to the notion of pedagogy, that is, to the methodology employed by teachers in the classroom. Indeed, pedagogy has so dominated our thinking during these years that the possibility that there is something in addition which is needed by prospective teachers if their preparation is to be of increasing and lasting value both to them and to the development of improved schools throughout their careers seems to have been entirely forgotten.

Because of this almost total stress on pedagogy the emergence of a glaring imbalance in the intellectual preparation of prospective teachers should not be perceived as an unlikely or an unexpected outcome. Why not? The reason can be simply stated. The model which has been most dominant in this aggressive pursuit of improved pedagogy has been the one which we associate with Ralph Tyler. This model starts with a predetermined statement of goals, followed by the development of a set of experiences related to these goals, through the implementation of these experiences in the classroom, and the evaluation of students who have been processed by these experiences. This technological, process-product model has come to dominate our thinking about schooling to such an extent that we have just about had eliminated from our consciousness the need for prospective teachers to become informed of what Soltis (and, I know, others) would argue "are persistent and perennial questions that are equally fundamental to the education of educators and that well-

educated educators need to meet and wrestle with them and incorporate them into their consciousness throughout their **whole careers** if they are to be truly educated professionals."[3](emphasis mine.)

What are some of these questions? Let me suggest a few of them. What are the ends of education? What are the kinds of education which will most likely achieve these ends? What are the alternative schema (maps) which reveal the different ways in which schooling can take place? What is normative, hermeneutical and critical thinking and how can these intellectual skills facilitiate the acquisition of understanding about schools? What knowledge is of most worth? How can we prioritize when we confront seemingly impossible choices in the curriculum? What is the nature of curriculum? How is education funded and what are the problems of equity which are related to such funding? What are the problems generated by the twin goals of excellence and equity? What is the relationship between public schools and a liberal democratic society? What are the contradictions and the inconsistencies which we find when we examine the practices and outcomes of our public schools?

While these by no means run the gamut of significant questions to be examined by those engaged in foundational study, they are enough to suggest that they are no less significant than the traditional philosopher's questions of what is the nature of reality, of truth, of value. They are made increasingly important at the present time because of the heavy stress being placed on the reform of our schools, a stress which often mitigates or even eliminates the need to consider these timeless educational matters.

It is absolutely essential that we take heed of this trend and consider its ramifications for prospective teachers if they continue to go into the field of public schooling with a lack of consciousness about these sorts of questions and the different responses which significant thinkers have suggested for them. What will be some of these likely ramifications? Let me consider several. First, we will be increasingly unable to communicate with one another in a language which is mutually understandable. Reasoned debate and deliberation will be unlikely to occur between members of the profession because of a lack of a common conceptual awareness. Not only will this severely hamper dialogue and decision-making, but it will prevent one from growing in an understanding of the meaning and significance of his profession in the years after

formal preparation has been completed. And, acquiring this conceptual orientation is made complex by the fact that different frameworks of thinking in various of the subdivisions of the foundations have their own sort of language, their own dictionary of terms one might say. One needs to know not only the language of that conceptual framework to which one is most closely aligned, but also that of alternative frameworks if one is to be able to comprehend others sympathetically. Only in this way can we be hopeful that dialogue, group deliberation and decision-making will be enhanced.

As Soltis has argued, educators "need to achieve a high level of intragroup literacy. They need to acquire the language and concepts of education, the background history, basic theoretical frameworks, central ideas, and common knowledge and traditions that give them the associative conceptual backgound that permits serious communication, dialogue, and debate ..."[4] No doubt prospective teachers will pick up bits of such knowledge from various pedagogical courses, but without sustained study in the historical, philosophical, curricular, psychological, political, economic, judicial and policy-making realms of the foundations such language and the ability to communicate within the profession in meaningful and significant ways will be sharply restricted, at best unintentionally distorted. Indeed, professionals are very likely to lose the ability to think sympathetically about the imagry being revealed by others and hence will lose very quickly their desire to work with others in considering the means for initiating and bringing about the normative improvement we desire in our schools.

Prospective teachers need to be made aware of how thoroughly enmeshed schools and schooling are in the economic, political, legal and social events at the local, state, and national levels. If anything has become clear during the past three decades it is that schools cannot stand apart as islands unrelated to the societal realities around them. Our emerging teachers must recognize the importance of the school-society relationship, and this can only be gotten by study in what has traditionally been called the foundations of education. It is true that during these years every effort has been made to put teacher preparation on a strong empirical footing. To do so has meant that much stress has been placed on educational psychology. And, to be sure, this has not all been wrong. But there is a need for a much broader and deeper consciousness about educational phenomena than can be derived from study in this field if

teachers are to acquire powerful understandings and a balanced perspective. To paraphrase Jarolimek in his most recent work,[5] the most profound challenges to education in modern times have to do less with psychology than with the sociological, economic, legal and political realities that prevail in the larger society. Yet these are fields in which many teachers receive little or no preparation. Indeed, a teacher's knowledge in these areas may be no better or even worse than that of the average person in the community. We must not forget that much of what happens in schools is predetermined through legislative requirements, state education codes, certification requirements, institutional policies, and tradition. Decisions affecting school practices are often made far from the classroom by persons or agencies that may have little to do with schools and teaching. The school establishment generally, and teachers specifically, are for the most part poorly prepared to deal with those remote centers of power that so profoundly affect their work.

The Response

As we move into the final decade of this century it might be well for us to consider the possibility that we have been spending too much of our time on the study of psychology and too little on the other dimensions of understanding to which I have alluded. In order to bring about a recognition of this broader scope of the professional dimension of teacher preparation I suggest that we add a new category of professional study to the professional dimension of preparation. Let us call this category **Educology.*** The professional dimension of undergraduate preparation, then, which accompanies the general/liberal education and the academic specialization dimensions, would consist of two disciplines, **pedagogy** and **educology.**

Each of these disciplines would consist of sub-disciplines. Pedagogy, for instance, would consist of methodologies in each of the subjects taught in our public schools, of audio-visual practices, of classroom management strategies, of measurement and evaluation, of computer applications, etc.

Educology would consist of such sub-disciplines as history of education, philosophy of education, curriculum theory, theories of learning, economics of education, politics of education, anthropology of education, sociology of education, policy studies, etc.

Clearly courses included within the sub-discipline of pedagogy would touch on matters found in various of the sub-disciplines found within educology. The same, of course, would be the case for the courses taught within the sub-disciplines of educology. Similar sorts of cross-fertilization undoubtedly occur between the various sub-disciplines found in any of the other disciplines included in a college/university curriculum, e.g., biology, English, psychology, sociology, chemistry, political science, etc.

The advantage of such a dual structure to the professional dimension of teacher preparation would be three-fold: First, of primary significance, it would accentuate the nature of the various sub-disciplines within both pedagogy and educology with which prospective teachers should become acquainted, thereby leading to a better balance in their preparatory programs. Second, the very nature of the sub-disciplines within both pedagogy and educology would compel those laboring in these fields to work closely with the respective academic departments to which their intellectual training most closely relates. This sort of inter-disciplinary relationship could work wonders in terms of bringing different sorts of people together for the purpose of considering the professional development of teachers. NCATE and others have for years stressed the fact that the preparation of teachers is a college/university wide responsibility, not simply that of the SCDE. Shulman has been stressing something of a similar sort with his suggestion that prospective teachers direct much more of their attention to the methods employed by their professors in the various disciplines in which they are majoring. It is here, he argues, that they will encounter people with a passion for their discipline, with a sensitivity to its concepts and underlying structures, and with a particular desire to want to represent and translate their discipline in ways which will enhance the quality of understanding by those whom they are instructing. Learning to teach, in other words, at least according to Shulman, is an all-college/university function. Every professor should recognize that what he is doing in the classroom may be having a lasting effect on the ways in which prospective teachers are learning to teach. Three, a good case can be made for the idea that all students on a college campus, regardless of their major or career intentions, have a need for understanding the questions of most significance which are related to schooling, particularly in a liberal, democratic society. Regardless of their particular majors, all students

eventually will be citizens in our society with a vested interest in the quality of schooling provided by our society. Clearly, the sub-disciplines of educology could be the source of intellectual understanding and skill which could constitute a worthy minor for students not intending to teach. Businessmen, for instance, have demonstrated their interest in schooling throughout the twentieth century. What better intellectual background for a prospective businessman than to have educology as a minor to accompany an economic or accounting background. For that matter, those in political science would also find it a most rewarding complement to their specialization.

Summary

In this paper I have attempted, albeit briefly, to bring to our attention the fact that the importance of those areas of intellectual development traditionally associated with the foundations of education, areas ordinarily thought to have been an essential dimension of the preparation of prospective teachers, have been severely curtailed during the past fifteen years. It has been suggested that one significant cause of this, though perhaps not the only one, has been the dedicated efforts by well-intentioned people to transform teaching into a mechanistic technology governed by what was referred to as the Tyler Rationale. To cope with this trend toward the obliteration of a significant dimension of consciousness required by prospective teachers, the suggestion has been made that the professional dimension of the undergraduate teacher preparation curriculum be organized within the framework of two sub-disciplines, **pedagogy** and **educology.**

*Note: While the author of this paper has employed the term 'educology' elsewhere, he is not the first to have employed the term. To the best of his knowledge the first to have done so was Elizabeth Steiner Maccia who used the term in a narrower and different sense than is being used in this paper.

Reading Notes

1. Ryle, Gilbert. (1949). The concept of mind. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 27.

2. Broudy, Harry S. (1979, May). "The brightes and the best." In: Phi Delta Kappan. 60: 643.

3. Soltis, Jonas F. (Spring, 1990). "A reconceptualization of educational foundations. Teachers College Record. 91:3, 313-314.

4. Ibid., 314.

5. Jarolimek, John. (1990). And there is teacher education ... . New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.